TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR WRITTEN ERROR CORRECTION TECHNIQUES

A THESIS PRESENTED BY
SELMA YILMAZ
TO
THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

BILKENT UNIVERSITY
AUGUST, 1996

TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR WRITTEN ERROR CORRECTION TECHNIQUES

A THESIS PRESENTED BY
SELMA YILMAZ
TO
THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

SELMA YILMAZ

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

AUGUST, 1996

ABSTRACT

Title: Teachers' and students' preferences for written error correction techniques
Author: Selma Yılmaz
Thesis Chairperson: Dr. Theodore S. Rodgers, Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Thesis Committee Members: Dr. Susan D. Bosher
Ms. Bena Gül Peker, MA TEFL Program

The treatment of learner errors has long been the subject of debate in second and foreign language teaching. Recommendations have changed in line with shifts in methodology. For example, in teaching writing as process, errors are treated in the editing stage, whereas in the traditional writing as product approach errors are treated in the first draft since students are not required to write any more drafts. Researchers and teachers have attempted to identify error editing techniques that do not interfere with the flow of meaning. This research study explored teachers' and students' attitudes toward error correction in writing as process, which techniques teachers use while correcting errors and which techniques teachers report using. The major question concerned the difference between teachers' and students' preferences for written error correction techniques. Another major question was about the difference between teachers' reported and actual usage of error correction techniques.

The participants were 16 teachers and 30 students from BUSEL, Bilkent University the School of English Language. Teacher and student questionnaires were used to gather data for this study. Data were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. For the comparison of teachers' and students' preferences, independent sample t-tests and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were run.

The results indicate that both teachers and students think error correction is useful and that the most important aspect of error correction in writing is the correction of grammatical errors rather than the correction of errors in vocabulary choice, spelling and punctuation. With regards to how many errors students would like their teachers to correct, the results indicate that students want their teachers to correct all errors and they do not approve no correction. However, teachers report that the extent of error correction depends on the student and the amount of time they have. Regarding teachers' and students preferences for error correction techniques results indicate that students want more explicit techniques such as crossing out the incorrect item and writing in the correct form. Teachers report that they use the techniques of using codes and also underlying the errors and writing in the correct

form. In actual practice teachers tend to use codes to indicate errors more than the other technique.

The results indicate that although teachers' and students' attitudes are similar in some aspects of error correction, their preferences for error correction techniques are different. The findings suggest important pedagogical implications about teachers' behavior with regards to correction. It is recommended that teachers determine students' preferences for error correction at the beginning of a writing course and give feedback on errors taking students' preferences into consideration.

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

August 29, 1996

The examining committee appointed by the
Institute of Economics and Social Sciences for the
thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Selma Yılmaz

---

has read the thesis of the student.
The committee has decided that the thesis
of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title	:	Teachers' and students' preferences for written error correction techniques
Thesis Advisor	:	Dr. Susan D. Bosher Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Committee Members	:	Professor Theodore S. Rodgers Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
		Ms. Bena Gul Peker Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our combined opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Susan D. Bosher
(Advisor)

Theodore S. Rodgers
(Committee Member)

(Bena Gül Peker)
(Committee Member)

Approved for the
Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Ali Karaosmanoğlu
Director
Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Susan D. Bosher, for her patience and invaluable guidance throughout this study. I am also grateful to Dr. Theodore S. Rodgers, the director of MA TEFL Program and Ms. Bena Gul Peker for their invaluable lectures.

I would also like to thank the administrators of Anadolu University, especially to the Rector, Prof. Dr. Akar Ocal and to the Dean of Education Faculty, Prof. Dr. Ahmet Konrot who gave me permission; to Prof. Dr. Gul Durmusoglu Kose and Ass. Prof. Hulya Ozcan who encouraged me to attend the Bilkent MA TEFL Program.

My most special thanks go to Ergin Ekinci and Selahattin Gelbal who offered their invaluable help for the calculations with the computer throughout the data analysis procedure.

My greatest thanks is to my mother, father and sisters, Fatma and Hulya, who have supported me with their understanding, patience and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose of the Study

In language learning, learners have always made errors and teachers have always felt responsible to respond to the errors of their learners. In recent years, treating learners' errors has attracted considerable attention since the errors themselves have been viewed as stepping stones in language learning. The shift in theories of second language learning from behavioristic to cognitive approaches has resulted in different attitudes of researchers and teachers toward errors and error correction (Hahn, 1987). In the behavioristic approach, errors were viewed as bad habits that should be prevented. However, in the cognitive approach, errors are considered a natural part of the learning process. Gaies (1983) states that errors are windows into the language acquisition process and are overt reflections of the internalized rules of language.

As in theories of second language learning, errors are viewed and treated in different ways in different approaches to the teaching of L2 writing. There are four approaches currently, each one with a distinctive focus (Raimes, 1991). In the process approach the focus is on the writer and the cognitive processes used in the act of writing; in the

content-based approach, the focus is on the content for writing; in the reader-dominated approach on the demands made by the reader. And in the product approach the focus is on the rhetorical and linguistic form of the text itself. In the product approach, the teacher usually corrects grammatical errors, more so than in the other three approaches.

With the recent shift in L2 writing from product to process, writing is viewed primarily as a process of discovering and making meaning (Berthoff, 1981). In this approach to writing, when students write compositions, teachers give written feedback on the content of their students' compositions. However, students at the early stages of L2 learning have difficulty perceiving writing at the level of content. Students prefer their teachers to concentrate on their grammar errors, they do not approve teacher comments which deal with only organization and content in their writing (Leki, 1991). Consistent with students' preferences, Cohen's (1988) study indicates that teachers deal primarily with grammar and mechanics and less with vocabulary, organization and content in L2 writing. Research on the effectiveness of teacher feedback that focuses on form indicates that error correction facilitates student improvement in grammatical accuracy (Fathman & Whalley, 1990). Long and Porter (1985) also claim that

error correction by the teacher is one of the necessary and sufficient conditions for successful foreign/second language learning. It is, of course, possible for the teacher to provide both error correction and content feedback. Fathman and Whalley (1990) state that without overburdening the student, grammar and content feedback can be provided to the student separately or at the same time.

The impetus for this research study originated from the needs I have observed at my institution, the Education Faculty at Anadolu University, where I have worked as a writing instructor for three years. The Education Faculty offers writing courses to Basic English, first, second and third year students. Students develop their skills in writing through process writing by discovering and making meaning and present their thoughts in the form of paragraphs and essays with various drafts. They also keep journals in which they express ideas about current events and their personal comments concerning the courses or the instructors. As the writing instructors, my colleagues and I have observed that although we prefer students to focus on ideas and meaning in their writing, most of the students prefer teachers to comment on grammar errors in their written work. We have observed that Turkish students, especially the lower proficiency-level students, feel more secure when teachers correct their grammar errors as opposed to teachers' not

indicating or correcting errors at all. As their instructors of L2 writing, we intervene at various stages of students' writing: pre-writing, drafting, composing, revising, editing. At the final stages of writing, we feel there is a need to correct some errors of form and mechanics. This view led me to think about the written error correction techniques that L2 teachers use. We, as L2 writing teachers, use different techniques while correcting students' written errors. However, the way we correct students' errors might not be those preferred by the students. Since most students prefer to be corrected grammatically, they may also have preferences for the teachers' error correction techniques and feedback strategies.

To find similar situations and problems, the literature on writing was searched through. Over the past 20 to 30 years there has been concern as to whether to respond to form or content or both, and how error correction should be handled. Most researchers agree that error correction should take place at the final stages of the writing process (Bosher 1990; Kroll, 1990; Raimes, 1983). Suggestions have also been made for teachers regarding which techniques to use while correcting errors (Edge, 1989; Hendrickson, 1980; Klassen, 1991). In addition, some research studies have been conducted to determine students' preferences for error

correction techniques (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Leki, 1991).

What is missing in the literature are studies that analyze whether the error correction techniques teachers use match the techniques students prefer. I believe it is necessary to know if teachers' error correction techniques correspond to students' preferences for error correction. Therefore, this research study is intended to fill this gap in the field of L2 writing.

In this research study, error correction techniques that teachers actually use and what they report using are investigated as well as what students' attitudes are toward error correction and which techniques students prefer their teachers to use. Another focus is to determine if there is difference between teachers' practice and students' preferences.

Research Questions

The research questions asked in this study were:

1. What are intermediate-level students' attitudes toward error correction? Do they want their errors to be corrected in their written work?

2. If intermediate-level students want their errors to be corrected, which techniques do they prefer teachers to use while correcting their written errors?

3. What are teachers' attitudes toward error correction?

4. Which written error correction techniques do teachers report using while correcting students' written errors?

5. Which error correction techniques do teachers actually use while correcting students' written errors?

6. Is there a difference between teachers' both actual and reported usage of error correction techniques and intermediate level students' preferences?

Significance of the Study

Given the assumption that most Turkish EFL students prefer teachers to correct their errors in written work, it is important to have an idea why students think that error correction is desirable. By learning students' reasons we can have new insights into our teaching of L2 writing; teachers can also be provided with valuable information about which techniques students prefer. This information will also give teachers a chance to reformulate their own behavior to meet students' needs in L2 writing.

The most important question to be answered is to what extent teachers' error correction techniques correspond with students' preferences for correction techniques. Because the rationale behind error correction is to help students learn the language and write more accurately, it is important to find out if students are getting what they want in the form they like it. Assuming students want to have their errors corrected and as teachers correct errors to help students improve their accuracy in the L2, teachers have the right to know which error correction techniques their students prefer.

In this way the significance of the study is best understood on two levels: from the teachers' point of view and from the students' point of view. Through this study, Turkish EFL teachers will have the opportunity to evaluate their error correction techniques and Turkish EFL students will have the opportunity to pass their preferences on to teachers about error correction techniques.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Students will make errors in second language learning and these errors are inevitable in spite of students' best efforts to produce sentences without errors (Abbott, 1980). Since learners make errors in their language learning process, how to treat language errors has been a subject of debate among teachers and researchers. The aim of this literature review is to provide information about the role of errors in L2 learning, the ways of responding to errors in process approach to writing, teachers' error correction techniques and students' preferences for teacher error correction.

As the theories of second language learning and teaching have changed, the ways of viewing and treating learners' errors have also changed. The first school of thought supported the view that language learning was habit formation and grammatical accuracy was important. This view was represented in the behavioristic theory to language learning (Corder, 1973). The behavioristic approach considered language as habitual behavior and viewed learners' errors as bad habits. According to this view, errors should be prevented or teachers should correct all errors immediately (Hendrickson, 1978).

The second school of thought supports the view that language is rule-governed and learners construct new utterances depending on the rules they have internalized (Krashen, 1982). This thought, represented in the cognitive theory of L2 learning views learners' errors as a natural part of language and as a beneficial element of learning.

Within the cognitive approach, several studies have demonstrated the significance of students' spoken and written errors in L2. Corder (1967) maintains that learners' errors can provide valuable evidence of the language learning process, and that, by systematically examining and classifying these errors, the researcher or teacher can infer strategies used by language learners. Thus, the errors language learners make in their attempt at communicating in a second language provide the key to their language learning process. Errors are believed to be an indicator of the learners' stages in their target language development (Lengo, 1995) and regarded as an overt reflection of the internalized rules of language (Gaies, 1983). They are tools for teachers to help students' progress easily and naturally through the stages of students' interlanguage (Gorbet, 1980).

The major shift in language learning theories from behaviorism to cognitivism has been followed by other changes. One such change is in the teaching of L2 writing

which has moved from a product approach to a process approach. As in language teaching methodologies, the treatment of errors has also changed with changing approaches to teaching writing (Raimes, 1991). And while treating errors in written work, different teachers apply different techniques. In the present study, teachers' and students' preferences for written error correction techniques will be examined. Since the rationale behind error correction in writing is to help students write more accurately, it is important to learn to what extent teachers' error correction techniques correspond with students' preferences for correction techniques. As background for this study, this chapter will review the literature on how teachers give feedback and correct errors in student writing and students' preferences for teacher feedback and error correction.

Error Correction in L2 Writing

When the behavioristic approach was dominant, it was supposed that speech was primary and writing had a subservient role that reinforced oral patterns. Composition tasks were controlled and students were asked to work with linguistic forms. Since errors were considered bad, writing tested the accurate application of grammar rules. Thus, teachers felt responsible to correct all errors and students

expected teachers to correct the errors in their writing (Raimes, 1991).

However, as the behavioral view toward language teaching changed and was replaced by a more cognitive view, researchers and teachers reacted against a form-dominated approach to writing. In process writing making meaning and multiple drafts are focused on rather than accuracy and patterned writing. Classroom tasks include writing journals and revising drafts, both of which attend to content before form. Teachers allow students to select topics, generate ideas, write drafts and revise. However, since students were still making errors, linguistic accuracy was delayed to the editing stage, after students finished dealing with ideas and organization (Raimes, 1991). As a result of the process approach to writing, students often get different responses from teachers: one to the content and organization, the other to the linguistic and mechanical form.

On the other hand, within the approach to writing as process, there is a general skepticism regarding error correction. Some studies have suggested that error correction does not lead to greater accuracy. Semke (1984) found that overt correction of student writing tended to have negative side effects on both the quality of subsequent compositions and on student attitudes toward writing in the

foreign language. Robb, Ross and Shortreed (1986) suggest that highly detailed feedback on sentence-level mechanics may not be worth the teacher's time and effort, even if students claim to need and use it.

On the other hand, some studies indicate the usefulness of error correction. For the past several years, Spada and Lightbrown (1993) have conducted a series of quasi-experimental studies to examine the contributions of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on the English L2 development of young francophone learners. Their results have indicated a positive effect of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on students' linguistic accuracy.

Fathman and Whalley's (1990) study of feedback and correction in writing demonstrates that students' revisions improved in overall quality and in linguistic accuracy when they received comments and corrections on both the content and form of their essays.

According to Raimes (1985), unskilled ESL writers know that they are language learners, that they use the language imperfectly and they expect the teacher to correct the language they produce. Raimes also claims that these students are focusing on meaning anyway, so teachers should consider the need to attend to product as well as process. She notes that students should be taught not only heuristic

devices to focus on meaning, but also heuristic devices to focus on rhetorical and linguistic features after the ideas have found some form.

Teachers' Preferences For Feedback and Error Correction Techniques

Although several studies have indicated the usefulness of error correction in writing, certain questions remain on some issues: Which errors should be corrected? by whom? when? how?

Regarding whether all errors should be corrected or only selected errors, Chastain (1980) claims that teachers who consider language as a linguistic system and the learner as a passive receiver in the learning process prefer correcting all errors, whereas those who see language as a means of communication and the learner as an active participant who can learn by hypothesis formation and testing prefer correcting errors selectively.

Regarding how to select the errors to be corrected, Rifkin and Roberts (1995) argue that classroom teaching should address primarily those errors that caused a failure in communication. Klassen (1991) states that the gravity of the error should determine whether correction is necessary. He refers to global and local errors as a measure of the gravity of errors. According to Klassen, global errors are

more serious and therefore, should be corrected. Burt and Kiparsky (1974) define global errors as those error types which effect the interpretation of the whole sentence, and local errors as those which effect only a part of a sentence, clause or phrase. Gwin (1991) claims that errors that can hinder communication, such as vocabulary confusion; violations of syntactic rules that obscure meaning; and incorrect, irrelevant or missing information, should be focused on.

As to who should correct the errors, traditionally the teacher has been responsible (Leki, 1991). In her study, Leki (1991) found out that students prefer to be corrected by their teacher rather than by peers.

As to when to correct errors, Gwin (1991) states that on the first draft he never tries to proofread, that is, point out all the minor mechanical errors of capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and so forth. Mahili (1994) suggests that teachers correct errors when responding to the second but not the first draft of a paper and should decide carefully which errors to correct. Raimes (1983) suggests teachers devise a system to indicate some or all of the errors in the students' second or third draft. Bosher (1990) notes that by placing editing for error at the final stage in the writing process, students will not become preoccupied with error or inhibited in

their discovery of meaning. She notes that in a composition class, it would be inappropriate to attend to errors until after the process of discovering meaning is complete, after students have written several drafts of a paper, and are satisfied with the content and organization of their papers.

Regarding how to correct errors, considering the number of approaches to teaching writing to choose from, teachers are faced with a similar variety of ways to respond to students' writing including error correction. Raimes (1991) states that since a response to a student's paper is potentially one of the most influential texts in a writing class, teachers should always be concerned about the best approach to error correction. Teachers can correct errors; code errors; locate errors; indicate the number of errors or ask students to comment on the source of the error; and/or ask L1 peers to reformulate the students' texts.

Additional articles have described these and other techniques that teachers might use while correcting students' written errors. Gwin (1991) notes that for proofreading as well as for other types of error correction, he employs the technique called correction by error identification codes (CEIC). Klassen (1991) mentions four techniques for correcting errors: (a) Teacher underlines errors; (b) Errors are categorized and coded

according to nine main types of errors: punctuation, nouns, verbs, modifiers, prepositions, syntax, lexical items, connectors and style; (c) Teacher uses crosses in the margin to indicate the presence of errors; and (d) Teacher corrects the errors.

Hendrickson (1980) describes a procedure for correcting written errors used by Burt and Kiparsky (1974), that is, using different color inks for distinguishing more important errors from less important ones. Hendrickson (1980) himself places a question mark above (^) to indicate a missing article or preposition. He claims that these indirect methods are used whenever it is assumed that students can correct their own errors using a good dictionary or grammar book.

Edge (1989) suggests teachers correct errors and then use a big question mark as a signal that asks the student if the correction conveys the meaning that the student wanted. He claims that if the teacher is right about what the student wanted to write, this gives the student a clear model of one way of saying it. If the teacher is wrong, it makes clear to the student that a higher level of accuracy is needed if communication is to take place.

Bosher (1990) suggests that teachers respond to the content and organization on one copy of the students' papers and on the second copy of the final draft to use a

correction code and mark for certain types of errors that are targeted beforehand based on the level and needs of individual students. She suggests students use the correction code to correct the errors when they receive the copy marked for corrections. She also suggests students keep a record of their errors by filling in an error analysis chart.

Students' Preferences for Teacher Feedback on Writing and Error Correction

There are some studies in which students have been asked about their assumptions about teachers' preferences for writing, student attitudes towards what is important in writing and the type of feedback students prefer to receive.

In a study by Schwartz (1984), on students' assumptions about what teachers think is most important in writing, students were asked to indicate which passage a teacher would prefer: one that is clear but lifeless or one that is colorful and creative but flawed mechanically. Students chose the first, indicating they think teachers view grammatical errors as more powerful in effect than voice.

Regarding students' attitudes towards what is most important in writing, Samuels (1985) reported that in a

survey he conducted, 84% of ESL students consider getting the grammar correct to be the most important aspect of their writing in English, 52% getting the punctuation correct and 20% communicating their ideas.

Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) investigated the error correction preferences of EFL and ESL students. They reported that EFL students paid more attention to form, whereas ESL students were as interested in teacher feedback on content as they were in sentence-level comments and corrections. The authors suggest that this result may be due to the fact that EFL students view L2 writing as a form of language practice and ESL students view it as a tool for accomplishing their academic endeavors.

Leki (1991) in an effort to gain insight into the attitudes of ESL student writers toward errors in their writing, surveyed 100 students of beginning ESL freshman writing classes. The students were from 37 different countries. All of them had scored at least 525 on the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language). The questionnaire she used consisted of four parts. Part one was designed to explore perceptions about the importance of accuracy. In part two students answered questions designed to learn what students do when a marked paper is given back to them by the teacher. In parts three and four students were asked about their preferences for error correction. The

students in this study showed a great deal of interest in having their errors pointed out to them. Nearly as many students claimed to always or usually look carefully at grammatical errors in their returned papers as those who reported carefully reading comments on organization and content. In response to the question how students prefer corrections to be made, 67 students said they wanted their teachers to show where the error was and to give a clue about how to correct it. Another 25 wanted teachers to write in the correct answers. Only two preferred that teachers only locate the error with no further clue; two said they preferred that teachers ignore errors and respond only to ideas; no students wanted teachers simply to tell the students that errors exist without revealing the location of the errors. Four students did not respond to the question.

Although there has been a shift from a product approach to a process approach in teaching writing, students still produce sentences with errors when trying to make meaning. Researchers and teachers have tried to find techniques that allow editing of errors without interfering with students' discovering and communicating meaning. Researchers and teachers have suggested how to give feedback to student writing and correct errors. However, many of these do not take students' preferences into consideration. My research

study attempts to explore which techniques teachers report using, as well as which they actually use, and what students' preferences are for error correction techniques. The study will also explore teachers' and students' attitudes towards error correction. Finally, teachers' and students' preferences for error correction techniques will be compared in order to see to what extent they are consistent.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

This study attempted to find out: (a) what students' attitudes are toward error correction in writing; (b) what teachers' attitudes are toward error correction; (c) which error correction techniques students prefer in their writing; (d) which error correction techniques teachers report using; (e) teachers' actual usage of error correction techniques. Teachers' reported and actual usage of error correction techniques and students' preferences for teachers' error correction techniques were compared to determine their degree of consistency.

Subjects

Two groups of subjects took part in this study, students and teachers at BUSEL, the Bilkent University School of English Language. Sixteen teachers, whose experience ranged from 3 to 29 years, responded to the questionnaire. The teachers were all Turkish except for one American. Two classes of intermediate-level students were selected from BUSEL. There was a total of 30 students in the two classes. Classes at BUSEL integrate the skills, so that there are no separate writing classes, but when written tasks are assigned, the process approach is applied, that is, students first try to make meaning, the teacher gives

comments on the ideas and later corrects errors, mostly at the editing stage.

Age and gender were not taken into consideration in this study because the research questions did not investigate those variables. However, since students were preparatory class students, their ages fell into the same scale: 17-20 years.

All the subjects agreed to participate in the study and signed a consent form (see Appendix A).

Instruments

Data were collected through two questionnaires: one for students and one for teachers. Teachers were also given two student paragraphs with errors to be corrected, in order to compare reported usage of error correction techniques with actual usage. The student questionnaire used in Leki's (1991) study was modified for use in this study.

Student Questionnaire

The student questionnaire (see Appendix B) was used to collect data about students' attitudes toward error correction, if they want error correction and their reasons, and their preferences for teachers' error correction techniques. In the student questionnaire there were three main parts: background, attitudes and preferences. In the

first part such questions as the high schools students graduated from, the departments students hope to attend and the length of time they have been studying English and so forth were asked to get information about their educational background.

In the second part of the questionnaire students were asked about their attitudes regarding teachers' error correction in general, through such questions as what do they think when teachers correct their errors or when teachers do not correct their errors, and what kind of errors would they like their teachers to correct. These questions were responded to using 5-point Likert scales of importance and agreement.

In the third part, students were asked for their preferences for error correction techniques. First, they were given eight types of error correction techniques and were asked to rank order these techniques from their most preferred to their least preferred. Then, they were given examples of specific error correction techniques and asked to respond using a 5-point Likert scale of like/dislike.

Teacher Questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire (see Appendix C) was used to collect data about what kind of written error correction techniques teachers report using. The teacher questionnaire consisted of the same items which were

included in the student questionnaire. Teachers were asked about their background, attitudes toward error correction and preferences for error correction techniques. In order to collect data about what teachers actually do while correcting student errors in writing, two paragraphs which contained different types of errors (errors in verb tenses, spelling, vocabulary, punctuation and so forth) were given to the teachers. Teachers were asked to correct these errors as they normally would correct a student composition.

Validity and Reliability of Questionnaires

The questionnaires contained a representative sample of possible attitudes toward error correction and techniques for error correction based on a through review of the literature.

Questionnaires were pilot-tested to ensure that the questions and the design were appropriate to the research questions and the format and the wording were clear. The questionnaires were revised after the pilot-testing based on feedback from the pilot testers. For example, in the student questionnaire explanations were provided for some of the words because students in the pilot-testing said they did not know the words, or in the teacher questionnaire, some additional items were included. For example, for priority of feedback on errors, teachers recommended that content is more important than form. As a result, this item was

included in the teacher questionnaire. These procedures increased the validity and reliability of the questionnaires.

Procedures

Pilot-testing

The student questionnaire was prepared in English. For pilot-testing an intermediate-level class was randomly selected to determine whether students at that level of proficiency were able to comprehend the items, as the subjects in this study were also intermediate-level.

The teachers for the pilot-testing were selected from BUSEL. These teachers were randomly selected, but taught in a different unit from the teachers who were subjects in this study, to ensure that no subjects would be involved in the pilot-testing of the questionnaires. Eight teachers responded to the pilot questionnaires.

Administration of Questionnaires

The revised questionnaires were given to the teachers who teach skill-integrated courses in English, at BUSEL, at a teachers' meeting for intermediate-level students. Since their classes were integrated all of the teachers were teaching writing and as a school procedure they were using a process approach in their teaching of writing. The response rate was 100% since the questionnaires were administered at

the meeting. Two teachers volunteered to administer the student questionnaires during their class-time.

There were five intermediate-level classes studying English at BUSEL at the time I administered the questionnaire. There were a total of 30 students in the classes who received the questionnaire. I assured the students that their names would not be used in the report. The instructions were not explained to the students in Turkish, however, they were allowed to ask meanings of any unknown words.

Data Analysis

Data collected through questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics which refers to a set of procedures used to describe different aspects of the data. Likert-scale and rank-order items were analyzed using means, standard deviations, frequencies and percentages. Responses to parallel items in teacher and student questionnaires were also compared and t-tests were run to find the difference between teachers' and students' preferences for error correction techniques. To find out to what extent teachers' and students' ratings and rankings for preferences of error correction techniques were consistent, responses were also compared using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients.

CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The focus of this study was to find out intermediate-level students' and teachers' attitudes toward error correction, students' preferences for error correction techniques and teachers' reported and actual use of error correction techniques. The major purpose was to find out the difference between students' preferences and teachers' both actual and reported usage of error correction techniques. Two groups of participants were involved in the study: intermediate-level students and teachers at BUSEL. Data were collected by means of a student questionnaire and a teacher questionnaire. Sixteen questionnaires were given to the teachers at a teachers' meeting, so all the teachers responded to the questionnaires. The response rate was 100%. Similarly, 30 questionnaires were given to students in two classes; thus, all the students gave the questionnaires back and the response rate was 100%.

Data Analysis Procedure

Student Questionnaire

In the student questionnaire (see Appendix B) there were three parts: background information, attitudes toward error correction and preferences for error

correction techniques. In the first part, such questions as the high schools students graduated from, the departments students hope to attend and the length of time they have been studying English were asked to get information about their educational background. In the second part, students were asked about their attitudes on teachers' error correction in general. In the last part, students rank-ordered their preferences for error correction techniques from the most preferred to the least preferred.

Three types of 5-point Likert-scales were included in the questionnaire for the students and also for the teachers. The first scale concerned the importance given to feedback on error correction in various aspects of written language proficiency such as grammatical form, punctuation and spelling; the second concerned students' and teachers' agreement with statements regarding compositions with or without error correction; and the third concerned whether the students and the teachers like the error correction techniques that were presented.

Teacher Questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire (see Appendix C) consisted of the same items that were included in the student questionnaire. Teachers were also asked to correct the errors as they normally would do on two student

compositions in order to compare whether they actually correct the errors using the same correction technique they report using. However, since teachers were responding to a research study, they might not have corrected the errors as they normally do.

After the data collection, in order to explore students' and teachers' attitudes toward error correction, frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated. To find out whether teachers and students were consistent in their ratings and rankings of error correction techniques, their responses were compared using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. To determine if there were any differences between students' and teachers' preferences for error correction techniques, independent sample t-tests were run.

Results of the Study

In this section of the chapter, the results of the data analysis are reported. Sample questionnaires are included in Appendices B and C. The order of presentation of items analyzed is not the same as the order of items in the questionnaires because item numbers were not the same in the teacher and student questionnaires. For each of the tables the item numbers from both the teacher and student questionnaires are

given so that the corresponding items in the original questionnaires can be easily located in the appendices. Item numbers from the teacher questionnaire are referred to by (T), from the student questionnaire by (S).

Priority of Feedback on Errors

Students were asked to indicate how important it is to them for the teacher to point out errors in grammatical form, punctuation, spelling and vocabulary choice using a 5-point Likert scale of importance. Once the means were calculated for each item, they were rank-ordered. Teachers were asked to rank-order the same items; another item "content is more important than form" was also included in the teachers' questionnaire. This item was not included in the table below as students were not asked a similar question. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Teachers' and Students' Priority of Feedback on Errors (Items T5 and S5)

Item	Teachers (N=16) M	Students (N=30) M
a. Grammatical form	2.00	1.63
b. Vocabulary choice	2.56	1.93
c. Spelling	4.26	2.53
d. Punctuation	4.56	3.10

Note. Student responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of importance, with 1=very important, 2=important, 3=somewhat important, 4=a little important, and 5=not important at all.

The results show that the rank ordering of the means was the same for both teachers and students. Both teachers and students gave the most importance to grammatical form (M=2.00 and 1.63, respectively); and the least important item according to these two groups was punctuation (M=4.56 and 3.10, respectively). Teachers rank-ordered "Content is more important than form" as their first choice. However, in the table above since students were not given this item, teachers' second choice "grammatical form" is referred to as their first choice. For a more detailed look at the responses, the percentages and frequencies of items "grammatical form" and "punctuation" are given in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2

Priority Given to Grammatical Form

(Items T5a and S6a)

	Teachers (N=16)		Students (N=30)	
	f (%)		f (%)	
	1= 6 (37.50)		1= 17 (56.67)	
	2= 4 (25.00)		2= 9 (30.00)	
M=2.00	3= 6 (37.50)	M=1.63	3= 2 (6.67)	
	4= 0		4= 2 (6.67)	
	5= 0		5= 0	
	16 (100)		30 (100)	Total

Note. Student responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of importance, with 1=very important, 2=important, 3=somewhat important, 4=a little important, 5=not important at all. Teacher responses were based on ranking, with 1=the most important, 5=the least important.

The results show that the vast majority of students (87%) think it is important to point out errors in grammatical form. Sixty-three percent of teachers rank-ordered grammatical form as their first and second choice. It is clear that both teachers and students give importance to pointing out errors in grammatical form. The results suggest that students are more concerned about grammar accuracy than teachers. Frequencies and percentages of item "punctuation" are given in Table 3.

Table 3

Priority Given to Punctuation

(Items T5b and S6b)

Teachers (N=16)		Students (N=30)		
	f (%)		f (%)	
	1= 0		1= 2 (6.67)	
	2= 0		2= 6 (20.00)	
M=4.56	3= 0	M=3.10	3= 10 (33.33)	
	4= 7 (43.75)		4= 11 (36.67)	
	5= 9 (56.25)		5= 1 (3.33)	
	16 (100)		30 (100)	Total

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of importance, with 1=very important, 2=important, 3=somewhat important, 4=a little important, 5=not important at all.

Pointing out errors in punctuation is the least important on a composition according to the teachers and students. Although 27% of students indicated punctuation as their first or second choice, none of the teachers indicated this item as their first, second or third most important aspect of written language to be corrected. It can be inferred from Tables 2 and 3 that for both teachers and students, the most important aspect of L2

error correction is grammatical accuracy, not vocabulary, spelling or punctuation.

Students' Attitudes toward Extent of Error Correction

The students were asked to indicate which errors they preferred their teachers to correct in their compositions. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Students' Attitudes toward Extent of Error Correction

(N=30) (Items S9a, b, c)

	All errors			Major errors			No errors		
	f (%)	M	SD	f (%)	M	SD	f (%)	M	SD
1=	14 (46.67)	1.73	.86	2 (6.67)	3.00	1.23	1 (3.33)	4.43	.97
2=	12 (40.00)			12 (40.00)			1 (3.33)		
3=	2 (6.67)			4 (13.33)			1 (3.33)		
4=	2 (6.67)			8 (26.67)			8 (26.67)		
5=	0			4 (13.33)			19 (63.33)		
	30 (100)			30 (100)			30 (100)	Total	

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of importance, with 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

The results show that the vast majority of students (87%) feel that all errors should be corrected in

contrast to 47% of students who feel that only major errors should be corrected. The vast majority of students (90%) disagree with the idea that the teacher should not correct any errors at all. It is clear from the data that students want to be corrected in their written work, and prefer that all errors be corrected compared with only major errors.

Teachers' Attitudes toward Extent of Error Correction

Teachers were asked to circle the strategies they use in order to find out the extent to which they correct errors while responding to student writing. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Teachers' Attitudes toward Extent of Error Correction

(N=16) (Item T4)

Item	f (%)
a-Depends on the student and the amount of time	9 (56.25)
b-The major errors	6 (37.50)
c-No correction	4 (25.00)
d-Frequently occurring errors	2 (12.50)
e-All the errors	2 (12.50)

Note. Responses were based on ranking, with 1=the most important, and 5=the least important.

Sixteen teachers responded to the teacher questionnaire. Since teachers were asked to circle all the options they use, the total number of responses to this item was 23. The results show that more than half of the teachers (56%) vary their responses to error correction depending on the student and the amount of time. Only 13% of the teachers reported that they correct all the errors, and 38% reported they correct major errors while 25% indicated that they do not correct any errors. It is clear from this data that error correction varies according to teachers' time and their students, although the vast majority of students (87%) want their teachers to correct all their errors. Thus, it can be inferred that students want more error correction than they are getting.

Students' Attitudes toward Final Drafts without Error Correction

Students were asked to indicate their feelings about final drafts of papers that are returned without corrections using a 5-point Likert-scale of agreement. The results are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6

Students' Attitudes toward Final Drafts without Error Correction, I (N=30)

(Items S8a, b, c)

Item	M	SD
a-Want to see errors corrected	1.83	1.05
b-Feel successful	2.53	1.47
c-Feel irritated	3.13	1.27

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, with 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

The means of the ratings were used to rank-order students' feelings about no error correction. The rank-order of means show that the most preferred item is "want to see errors corrected" (M=1.83). For a more detailed look at the responses, the frequencies and percentages are given in Table 7.

Table 7

Students' Attitudes toward Final Drafts without Error Correction, II (N=30)

(Items S8a, b, c)

Want to see errors corrected	Feel successful	Feel irritated	
f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	
1= 14 (46.67)	9 (30.00)	4 (13.33)	
2= 11 (36.67)	10 (33.33)	6 (20.00)	
3= 2 (6.67)	2 (6.67)	6 (20.00)	
4= 2 (6.67)	4 (13.33)	10 (33.33)	
5= 1 (3.33)	5 (16.67)	4 (13.33)	
30 (100)	30 (100)	30 (100)	Total

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, with 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, and 5=strongly disagree.

The results show that students want to see their errors corrected on the final draft of their composition. As shown in Table 7, the vast majority of students (83%) want their teacher to correct their errors on their final drafts. The majority of students (63%) feel successful when their errors are not corrected. Only 33% of students feel irritated when the errors on their final draft are not corrected. However, 46% of students do not feel irritated when their errors are not corrected. The

spread of results to this item shows that although the vast majority of students want to see their errors corrected, they do not feel irritated when the teacher does not correct the error. It can be inferred that when the teacher does not correct their errors, students think they do not have many errors, and do not feel irritated.

Students' Attitudes toward Final Drafts with Error Correction

Students were asked to indicate their feelings when the teacher corrects their errors on their final drafts. The results are given in Table 8.

Table 8

Students' Attitudes toward Final Drafts with Error Correction (N=30)

(Item S7a, b, c)

Feel confident f (%)	Feel irritated f (%)	Do not like correction f (%)	
1= 8 (26.67)	4 (13.33)	2 (6.67)	
2= 10 (33.33)	3 (10.00)	4 (13.33)	
3= 7 (23.33)	6 (20.00)	5 (16.67)	
4= 2 (6.67)	14 (46.67)	9 (30.00)	
5= 3 (10.00)	3 (10.00)	10 (33.33)	
30 (100)	30 (100)	30 (100)	Total

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, with 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

The results show that the majority of students (60%) agree that they feel confident when their errors are corrected by the teacher, compared with 17% of the students who do not feel confident. Fifty-seven percent say they do not feel irritated by the correction of their errors. The majority of students (63%) say they like error correction, compared with 20% who do not like error correction. These results clearly indicate that students want to be corrected in their written work.

Students' Attitudes toward Usefulness of Error Correction

Students were asked whether they learn from the correction of errors and whether error correction helps them avoid the same errors the next time they write. In addition, students were asked whether they feel secure when their errors are corrected, since the paper does not indicate any more errors, or whether they think error correction is not useful to them (See Tables 9 and 10).

Table 9

Students' Attitudes toward Usefulness of Error Correction, I (N=30)

(Items S10a, b, c, d)

Item	M	SD
a-Learn from the correction	1.56	.62
b-Can avoid the same error next time	1.76	.72
c-Feel confident	2.60	1.22
d-Correction is not useful	4.16	1.08

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, with 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

Table 9 shows the rank order of students' ratings of their attitudes toward the benefits of error correction. Students felt most strongly that they learn from error correction (M=1.56), closely followed by being able to

avoid the same error the next time (M=1.76). The last item in the ranking, that the students disagreed with the most, was correction is not useful (M=4.16).

For a more detailed look at the responses, frequencies and percentages are given in Table 10.

Table 10

Students' Attitudes toward Usefulness of Error Correction, II (N=30)

(Items S10a, b, c, d)

	Learn from the correction	Can avoid same error next time	Feel confident	Correction is not useful
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1=	15 (50.00)	12 (40.00)	6 (20.00)	1 (3.33)
2=	13 (43.33)	13 (43.33)	10 (33.33)	3 (10.00)
3=	2 (6.67)	5 (16.67)	6 (20.00)	0
4=	0	0	6 (20.00)	12 (40.00)
5=	0	0	2 (6.67)	14 (46.67)
	30 (100)	30 (100)	30 (100)	30 (100) Total

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, with 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, and 5=strongly disagree.

As shown in Tables 9 and 10, students think that they learn from the correction of their errors. Almost all students (93%) agree that they learn from the

correction of their errors. The vast majority of students (83%) think that they can avoid the same error the next time they write. No students strongly disagree or disagree that they learn from the correction, or that they can avoid the same error the next time. The vast majority of the students (87%) believe that error correction is useful. These results indicate the strong positive attitudes of students toward the usefulness of error correction.

Teachers' Attitudes toward Usefulness of Error Correction

The teachers were asked to indicate what they think about the idea that teachers should only deal with content and organization on the final draft; and they were also asked whether they think error correction is useful. The results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Teachers' Attitudes toward Usefulness of Error Correction, I (N=16)

(Items T6a and b)				
Teacher should deal only with content and organization			Do not believe error correction is useful	
	f (%)			f (%)
	1= 1 (6.25)			0
M=3.43	2= 1 (6.25)		M=4.18	2 (12.50)
SD=1.03	3= 6 (37.50)		SD=1.04	1 (6.25)
	4= 6 (37.50)			5 (31.25)
	5= 2 (12.50)			8 (50.00)
	16 (100)			16 (100) Total

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, with 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

The results show that the vast majority of the teachers (81%) believe that error correction is useful. Half of the teachers (50%) think that teachers should not deal only with content and organization.

Teachers were also asked whether they agree that students learn from the correction of errors and will avoid the same error next time. The results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Teachers' Attitudes toward Usefulness of Error Correction, II (N=16)

(Items T7a and b)				
Students learn from the correction of errors		Students will avoid same error next time		
	f (%)		f (%)	
	1= 5 (31.25)		0	
M=2.00	2= 8 (50.00)	M=3.06	6 (37.50)	
SD=.96	3= 1 (6.25)	SD=.99	4 (25.00)	
	4= 2 (12.50)		5 (31.25)	
	5= 0		1 (6.25)	
	16 (100)		16 (100)	Total

Note. Responses were based on a 5- point Likert scale of agreement, with 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

The results show that the vast majority of teachers (81%) agree that students learn from the correction of errors. Only 13% of the teachers disagree that students learn from the correction of errors. With regards to whether students will avoid the same error the next time, 38% of the teachers agree that students will avoid the same error the next time, 38% disagree and 25% neither agree nor disagree. These results show teachers' skepticism about the usefulness of error correction when

compared with 83% of the students who think they can avoid the same errors the next time they write. Teachers think that students learn from error correction, but their writing does not necessarily become more accurate as a result.

Students' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques

In the third part of the questionnaire students were asked to rank order their preferences for teacher error correction techniques from the most preferred (1) to the least preferred (9). The results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Students' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques I (N=30) (Item S11)

Item f(%)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
a-Crosses out what is incorrect writes in correct form	15(50.00)	2(6.67)	5(16.67)	1(3.33)	3(10.00)	3(10.00)	1(3.33)	0	0
b-Underlines the error but does not correct it	6(20.00)	6(20.00)	4(13.33)	2(10.00)	3(10.00)	2(6.67)	3(10.00)	2(6.67)	2(6.67)
c-Uses codes	1(3.33)	7(23.33)	11(36.67)	2(6.67)	3(10.00)	2(6.67)	1(3.33)	2(6.67)	1(3.33)
d-Explains to the whole class	2(6.67)	1(3.33)	1(3.33)	3(10.00)	5(16.67)	6(20.00)	5(16.67)	5(16.67)	1(3.33)
e-Explains orally to individuals	2(6.67)	7(23.33)	4(13.33)	5(16.67)	2(6.67)	4(13.33)	4(13.33)	2(6.67)	0
f-Uses different color inks	4(13.33)	3(10.00)	4(13.33)	7(23.33)	2(6.67)	4(13.33)	4(13.33)	2(6.67)	0
g-Only says there are errors	0	0	1(3.33)	6(20.00)	2(6.67)	4(13.33)	5(16.67)	9(30.00)	3(10.00)
h-Ignores errors	0	1(3.33)	0	3(10.00)	7(23.33)	4(13.33)	6(20.00)	8(26.67)	1(3.33)
i-Other:	0	0	0	1(3.33)	2(6.67)				

Note. One student did not state a preference for item "d". Item "i" was optional, so only three students gave opinions for this item: 1) Write the essay with teacher again, 2) Write the errors under the paper, and 3) Concentrate on meaning.

As shown in Table 13 half of the students (50%) ranked "the teacher crosses out what is incorrect and rewrites in the correct form" as their most preferred error correction technique. Another 23% of students ranked this technique second or third.

Twenty percent of the students ranked "the teacher underlines the error but does not correct it" as their first preference, and another 33% gave it their second or third preference. Although only 3% of students put "the teacher indicates the errors using codes" in first place, 59% put it in second or third place.

Only 7% of students put the item "teacher explains to the whole class" in first place and another 7% in second and third place. Seven percent of students ranked the item "teacher explains orally to individuals" as their first preference, and 36% as their second or third preference. The item "teacher uses different color inks" was ranked in the first place by 13%, in the second or third place by 23%.

No students ranked the item "teacher ignores errors" as their first or third preference; only 3% of students ranked it as their second preference. No students put the item "teacher only says there are errors and students must find them" in the first or second place. Only 3% put it in the third place.

It is clear that students not only want their teachers to correct the errors on their final draft, but they want to be corrected explicitly as well, that is, they want to see the correct form directly. Students do not want to find the errors themselves, they want to be corrected by the teacher, as already indicated in the attitudes part of the questionnaire.

To increase the reliability of students' responses regarding specific error correction techniques, students were also asked to respond to these same items which showed the teachers' application of these techniques using a 5-point Likert scale of like/dislike. Students were given examples of each of these error correction techniques and asked to indicate their degree of like or dislike for each technique. The results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Students' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques, II (N=30) (Item S12)

Item	f (%)	1	2	3	4	5
a-When I got up it is raining		1(3.33)	1(3.33)	2(6.67)	3(10.00)	21(70.00)
b-When I got up it is raining		3(10.00)	7(23.33)	12(40.00)	3(10.00)	5(16.67)
c-When I got up it is raining		4(13.33)	9(30.00)	5(16.67)	5(16.67)	6(20.00)
d-When I got up it is raining		1(3.33)	10(33.33)	10(33.33)	4(13.33)	5(16.67)
e-When I got up it is raining		19(63.33)	6(20.00)	4(13.33)	1(3.33)	0
f-When I got up it is raining		1(3.33)	2(6.67)	4(13.33)	9(30.00)	14(46.67)

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of like/dislike, with 1=strongly like, 2=somewhat like, 3=neither like nor dislike, 4=somewhat dislike, and 5=strongly dislike.

The results show that the vast majority of students (83%) liked example "e" in which the teacher crossed out the incorrect item and wrote the correct form: (When I got up it is raining). As shown in Table 13, when students rank-ordered the descriptions of the error correction techniques, the item "teacher crosses the incorrect and rewrites in the correct form" was ranked as the first preference by half of the students (50%).

Example "c" of the teacher underlining or circling the error, but not correcting it was liked by 43% of the students. When students rank-ordered the description of this example: "teacher underlines or circles the error but does not correct it", 20% of students put it as first, 20% as second preference.

Example "d" of the teacher using codes as an error correction technique (when I got up it is raining) was liked by 36% of the students. The percentage of students who rank-ordered the description "teacher uses codes" as first preference was 3% and second preference was 23%.

Example "f" in which there was no correction, but teacher indicated there was error someplace in the sentence was disliked by a large majority of students (77%). In the rank-order of descriptions no students listed the correction technique "teacher only says there are errors" as their first or second preference, but 17% ranked it as their seventh preference, 30% ranked it as

their eighth and 10% as their least preferred error correction technique.

Example "a" in which there is no correction was liked by only 6% of the students. On the other hand, it was disliked by a vast majority of the students (80%). When students rank-ordered "teacher ignores errors", no students listed it as their first or third preference, and only 3% listed it as their second preference.

Example "b" in which the teacher does not correct errors but comments on ideas was liked by 33% of the students. Twenty-seven percent of students disliked this item, and another 40% neither liked nor disliked it.

When students were asked to rank-order the descriptions of error correction techniques, they were also asked to report if they have any alternative techniques that they would prefer. One student reported that the teacher should concentrate on content and meaning, and rank-ordered it as his/her fifth preferred item.

As the results show, the most preferred example of the error correction techniques is teachers' crossing out the incorrect item and rewriting in the correct form. The least preferred example of the error correction techniques is teachers' not indicating errors, that is, no correction.

In order to investigate whether students were consistent in their preferences for error correction techniques, that is, whether the relationships between the ratings and rankings of the error correction techniques were statistically significant, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed (see Table 15).

Table 15

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients of Students' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques (N=30) (Items S11 and 12)

Item	r
1=Crosses out the incorrect item, writes in the correct form (When I got up it is raining	.40*
2=Comments on ideas (When I got up it is raining)	.32*
3=Circles or underlines, but does not correct (When I got up it is raining)	-.06
4=Uses codes (When I got up it is raining)	.31*
5=Only says there are errors (When I got up it is raining)	.30*
6=Ignores errors (When I got up it is raining)	.33*

*p<.05.

The correlations between the ratings and the rankings of error correction techniques were all moderately significant at p<.05 (r ranged from .30 to .40), with one exception: "circles or underlines the

Table 15

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients of Students' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques (N=30) (Items S11 and 12)

Item	r
1=Crosses out the incorrect item, writes in the correct form (When I got up it is raining	.40*
2=Comments on ideas (When I got up it is raining)	.32*
3=Circles or underlines, but does not correct (When I got up it is raining)	-.06
4=Uses codes (When I got up it is raining)	.31*
5=Only says there are errors (When I got up it is raining)	.30*
6=Ignores errors (When I got up it is raining)	.33*

*p<.05.

The correlations between the ratings and the rankings of error correction techniques were all moderately significant at p<.05 (r ranged from .30 to .40), with one exception: "circles or underlines the

error but does not correct it". The results of the Pearson product-moment correlations show that students' responses were generally consistent between their ratings and rankings.

Teachers' Preferences For Error Correction Techniques

Teachers were also asked to rank order the same items in the student questionnaire in order to find out their preferences for error correction techniques, and to be able to compare students' preferences and teachers' reported preferences for error correction techniques. The results are shown in Table 16.

Table 16

Teachers' Preferences For Error Correction Techniques, I (N=16) (Item T8)

Item f (%)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
a-Crosses out what is incorrect writes in the correct form	3(18.75)	2(12.50)	3(18.75)	2(12.50)	1(6.25)	1(6.25)	2(12.50)	1(6.25)	0
b-Underlines the error but does not correct it	6(37.50)	1(6.25)	4(25.00)	1(6.25)	2(12.50)	1(6.25)	1(6.25)	0	0
c-Uses codes	4(25.00)	6(37.50)	2(12.50)	1(6.25)	1(6.25)	0	1(6.25)	0	0
d-Explains to the whole class	0	1(6.25)	0	2(12.50)	4(25.00)	4(25.00)	2(12.50)	1(6.25)	0
e-Explains orally to individuals	1(6.25)	2(12.50)	3(18.75)	5(31.25)	1(6.25)	3(18.75)	0	0	0
f-Uses different color inks	1(6.25)	0	0	2(12.50)	2(12.50)	2(12.50)	3(18.75)	3(18.75)	1(6.25)
g-Only says there are errors	0	0	0	0	3(18.75)	2(12.50)	3(18.75)	5(31.25)	1(6.25)
h-Ignores errors	0	3(18.75)	1(6.25)	0	1(6.25)	2(12.50)	2(12.50)	5(31.25)	1(6.25)
i-Other	1(6.25)	0	2(12.50)	1(6.25)	0	0	0	0	1(6.25)

Note. Two teachers did not respond to item "d", "f", or "g"; one teacher to item "c" or "e"."Other" techniques were: 1) Meet with students individually, elicit correct grammar; 2) Put on the board, ask students; 3) Show on the paper, later explain orally; 4) Peer-correction; 5) Write on the board, ask students.

As shown in Table 16, 38% of the teachers placed "underlining or circling the error but not correcting it" as their first choice for preferred error correction technique, and 31% for their second or third choice. Twenty-five percent chose "using codes" as their most preferred technique and half of the teachers (50%) for their second or third preference. Nineteen percent of teachers listed "crossing out the incorrect item and rewriting in the correct form" as their first choice and 32% as their second or third choice. No teachers listed the items "explains to the whole class", "only says there are errors", or "ignores errors" as their first preference. Only 6% of teachers listed "explains orally to individual students" and 6% listed "uses different color inks" as their first preference.

The results show that according to teachers' reports the most preferred error correction technique is "using codes to indicate errors" and teachers' second preference according to their reports is "underlining or circling the error but not correcting it".

Teachers were also asked to rate the examples of error correction techniques using a 5-point Likert scale of like/dislike. The results are shown in Table 17.

Table 17

Teachers' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques, II (N =16) (Item T9)

Item f (%)	1	2	3	4	5
a-When I got up it is raining	0	0	0	4(25.00)	12(75.00)
b-When I got up it is raining	2(12.50)	2(12.50)	4(25.00)	2(12.50)	6(37.50)
c-When I got up it is raining	4(25.00)	10(62.50)	1(6.25)	1(6.25)	0
d-When I got up it is raining	8(50.00)	5(31.25)	1(6.25)	1(6.25)	1(6.25)
e-When I got up it is raining	1(6.25)	5(31.25)	4(25.00)	2(12.50)	4(25.00)
f-When I got up it is raining	2(12.50)	7(43.75)	4(25.00)	1(6.25)	2(12.50)

Note. Responses were based on a 5-point scale of like/dislike, with 1=strongly like, 2=somewhat like, 3=neither like nor dislike, 4=somewhat dislike, 5=strongly dislike.

The results show that the vast majority of teachers (81%) liked the example of the error correction technique "uses codes". When teachers were asked to rank order the descriptions of error correction techniques, 25% listed the item "teacher uses codes" for their first choice and 38% for their second choice.

Example "e" of "teacher crosses out what is incorrect and writes in the correct form" was liked by only 37% of the teachers; 37% reported they did not like this technique. When teachers rank-ordered the description "teacher crosses out what is incorrect and writes in the correct form", 19% listed it as their first choice, 13% as their second.

Example "a" in which there is "no correction" was disliked by all teachers. When teachers rank-ordered the description however, 19% listed "teacher ignores errors" as their second choice.

Example "c" of "underlining or circling the error, but not correcting it" was liked by the vast majority of teachers (88%). When teachers rank-ordered the description for the example "underlining or circling the error, but not correcting it", 44% listed it as their first or second choice, and 25% listed it as their third choice.

Example "f" of indicating that "there is error someplace in the sentence" was liked by 57% of the teachers. However, when teachers rank-ordered the description for this error correction technique, no teachers listed it as their first, second, third or even fourth choice.

Example "b" in which the teacher "does not correct errors, but comments on ideas", was liked by only 26% of the teachers. When teachers rank-ordered the description for this technique, only 19% listed it as their second choice and 6% as their third choice.

In order to find out whether teachers' preferences were responded to consistently, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between the ranking of error correction techniques and the rating of examples of each technique. Results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients of Teachers' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques

(N=16) (Items T8 and 9)

Item	r
1=Crosses out what is incorrect writes in the correct form (When I got up is raining)	.68*
2=Comments on the ideas (When I got up it is raining)	.16
3=Underlines or circles error but does not correct (When I got up it is raining)	.08
4=Uses codes (When I got up it is raining)	.42*
5=Only says there are errors (When I got up it is raining)	.30*
6=Ignores errors (When I got up it is raining)	.32*

p<.05.

The correlation between the ranking and the rating of the technique "crosses out the incorrect item and writes in the correct form" was strong, at r=.68, with p<.05. Correlations between the rankings and the ratings of error correction techniques "uses codes", "only says

there are errors" and "ignores errors" were moderate and significant (at r=.42, .30, and .32, respectively). Correlations between the rankings and ratings of "circles or underlines error, but does not correct it", "comments on the ideas" and "only says there are errors" were not significant. In sum, the correlation between teachers' rankings and ratings were not as consistent as the students' rankings and ratings. This may reflect teachers' skepticism about error correction, that is, teachers want to focus on meaning; however, they feel a need to correct errors.

Differences between Students' and Teachers' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques

In order to compare students' preferences and teachers' reported preferences for error correction techniques, T-tests were run on the mean scores of their rankings. Table 19 lists the means and standard deviations of students' and teachers' mean scores.

Table 19

Students' and Teachers' Preferences For Error Correction Techniques

Item	Students (N=30) M	SD	Teachers (N=16) M	SD
a-Crosses out incorrect item writes in the correct form	2.60	1.97	3.86	2.47
b-Uses codes	3.83	2.06	2.53	1.68
c-Underlines or circles the error, but does not correct it	4.00	2.63	2.93	1.98
d-Explains orally to individuals	4.20	2.15	3.80	1.52
e-Uses different color inks	4.26	2.16	6.07	2.12
f-Other	4.66	.57	4.00	3.00
g-Explains to the whole class	5.65	2.09	5.42	1.50
h-Ignores errors	6.26	1.66	5.93	2.52
i-Only says there are errors	6.50	1.81	6.92	1.32

Note. Other (Students): 1) Write the essay with teacher again, 2) Write the errors under the paper, 3) Concentrate on meaning. Other (Teachers): 1) Meet with students individually, elicit correct grammar; 2) Put on the board ask students to correct (Two teachers reported this technique); 3) Show on the paper, later explain orally; 4) Peer correction.

As shown in Table 19 students' most preferred error correction technique is "crosses out the incorrect item and writes in the correct form" (M=2.60). Teachers' most

preferred error correction technique, however, is "uses codes to indicate errors" (M=2.53). The item "underlines or circles the error, but does not correct it" is the second preference of teachers (M=2.93); however, students do not prefer it as much as teachers do (M=4.00).

Table 20 lists the rank-order of the means of students' and teachers' preferences for error correction techniques.

Table 20

Rank-order of the Means of Students' and Teachers' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques

Item	Students (N=30)	Teachers (N=16)
a-Crosses out incorrect item writes in the correct form	1	4
b-Uses codes	2	1
c-Underlines or circles the error, but does not correct it	3	2
d-Explains orally to individuals	4	3
e-Uses different color inks	5	8
f-Other	6	5
g-Explains to the whole class	7	6
h-Ignores errors	8	7
i-Only says there are errors	9	9

$p<.05$.

The rankings in Table 20 indicate that overall teachers' and students' rankings of error correction techniques were consistent (r=.80). However, the differences between students' and teachers' rank-order for the techniques a, b, and e, "crosses out the incorrect item and writes in the correct form" (students 1, teachers 4) "uses codes" (students 2, teachers 1) and "uses different color inks" (students 5, teachers 8) were not consistent.

To determine if these differences between students' and teachers' rankings of error correction techniques were statistically significant, t-tests were run on the mean scores of the rankings. The results are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Independent Sample T-tests on Students' and Teachers' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques

(Teachers N=16; Students N=30)

Item	t	df	p value
a-Crosses out incorrect item writes in the correct form	1.86	43	.06
b-Uses codes	-2.10	43	.04*
c-Underlines or circles the error but does not correct it	-1.40	44	.16
d-Explains orally to individuals	-0.36	41	.71
e-Uses different color inks	2.58	42	.01**
f-Other	-0.36	6	.72
g-Explains to the whole class	-0.36	41	.71
h-Ignores errors	-0.53	43	.59
i-Only says there are errors	.78	42	.43

*p<.05.

**p<.01.

The means of the t-tests, as presented in Table 21, indicate that overall there was not much difference between students' and teachers' preferences for error correction techniques. There were only two statistically significant differences between students' and teachers' mean scores: "uses codes" and "uses different color inks". The difference between students' and teachers'

preferences for the technique "uses codes" was significant, at $p<.05$. This result shows that there is a difference between students' and teachers' preferences for this technique. The mean scores indicate that teachers prefer the technique "uses codes" more than students do.

The difference between students' preferences and teachers' preferences for the item "uses different color inks for distinguishing more important errors from less important ones" was highly significant, at $p<.01$. As mean scores show, this technique was students' fifth preference; however, teachers' preference for this item was eighth. This means that students prefer teachers' using different color inks for distinguishing more important errors from less important ones to a much greater extent than do teachers.

Differences between Teachers' Reported and Actual Usage of Error Correction Techniques

To find out whether teachers' reported usage and actual usage of error correction techniques were consistent, teachers were given two paragraphs on the teacher questionnaire to correct. The first paragraph consisted more of grammar, punctuation and spelling errors (see Appendix C) that did not result in meaning confusion. However, the second paragraph was full of errors that made it difficult to understand the meaning.

Five teachers did not correct the errors on the paper and noted that they would call the students to give oral feedback individually. The rest of the teachers corrected the errors on these paragraphs. In the first paragraph there were a total of fourteen and in the second paragraph thirteen, grammar, spelling and punctuation errors. When the teachers' error correction techniques for this paragraph were analyzed, the results indicated that teachers tended to correct all the grammar errors and pay attention to spelling errors, but not to mechanics and punctuation.

Analysis of teachers' actual correction techniques indicates that teachers used only two of the error correction techniques:

a) "teacher underlines or circles the error but does not correct it", and

b) "teacher uses codes".

In the ranking "underlining or circling the error, but not correcting" it was preferred by 44% of the teachers as their first choice. "Using codes" was preferred by 53% of teachers as their first or second choice. If the error causes difficulty in understanding the meaning, five teachers said they preferred talking to the student individually. This technique "explains orally to individual students" was preferred by 6% of teachers as

their first choice, 13% of the teachers as their second choice.

To find out whether there was a difference between what teachers say they prefer and what they actually do with regards to error correction techniques, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated (see Table 22).

Table 22

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients of Teachers' Reported and Actual Usage of Error Correction Techniques

Technique	r
1=Underlines or circles the error but does not correct	.48*
2=Uses codes	.20

p<.05.

When the number of corrections on the students' paragraphs and teachers' reported preferences were correlated for the error correction technique "underlines or circles the error but does not correct it", the result was a moderate and significant correlation of r=.48, with

$p<.05$. That is, what teachers do and what they say they prefer is consistent. However, the relationship between teachers' reported and actual usage for the technique "uses codes" was not significant, that is, what teachers say they prefer is not consistent with what they actually do ($r=.19$). Teachers actually use the technique "uses codes" more than they report using it.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine: (a) intermediate-level students' and teachers' attitudes toward error correction; (b) students' preferences for error correction and error correction techniques; (c) teachers' reported preferences for error correction techniques; (d) teachers' actual usage of error correction techniques; and (e) any differences between intermediate-level students' and teachers' usage of error correction techniques in student writing.

Attitudes toward error correction and preferences for error correction techniques were investigated by distributing questionnaires to both students and teachers. Revised questionnaires, after pilot-testing, were administered to 16 teachers during a staff meeting and to a total of 30 students whose teachers volunteered to administer the questionnaires in their classes.

Results were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. To find whether students and teachers were consistent in their ratings and rankings of error correction techniques, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed. In order to determine if there were any significant differences between

students' and teachers' preferences, independent sample t-tests were run.

Discussion of the Results and Conclusions

This section of the chapter discusses the findings of the study and the conclusions that have been drawn in relation to the research questions. Some of the studies that have been discussed in the review of the literature are also referred to in relevant parts.

Attitudes toward Error Correction

Students prefer their errors to be corrected rather than teachers' not dealing with their errors at all. A vast majority of the students (84%) reported that they would like to see their errors corrected. This finding is very similar to Leki's (1991) findings. In her study, Leki found that almost all students (94%) wanted their errors to be corrected by the teacher.

Sixty percent of the students reported that they feel confident about their writing when the teacher corrects errors in their compositions. Almost all students (93%) reported that they learn from the correction of their errors and they think (83%) they can avoid the same error the next time they write. As Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) suggest in their study, this result may depend on students' perceptions of L2 writing as a form of language practice.

However, teachers do not have a consistent idea about whether students will avoid the same error next time. Although 81% of teachers reported that students learn from correction of their errors, only 38% of teachers reported that they think students will avoid the same error the next time. Another 38% reported that they do not think students will avoid the same error the next time. The vast majority of teachers (81%) think students learn from the correction of their errors, which supports Fathman and Whalley's (1990) findings that when students' errors are corrected, linguistic accuracy is improved. Thus, both teachers and students think that students learn from error correction. However, there is a contradiction in teachers' opinions.

The vast majority of teachers (86%) also reported that teachers should not only deal with content and organization in their feedback on writing, but should also correct errors. They (81%) state that error correction is useful. The vast majority of students (87%) also state that error correction is useful. In sum, both teachers and students find error correction useful. Although there has been no direct research about teachers' attitudes toward error correction in the literature, discussion of various pedagogical techniques and strategies for error correction implies that teachers believe that error correction should take place. For example, Bosher (1990) states that teachers

should correct errors after the process of discovering meaning is complete and Raimes (1983) suggests teachers indicate errors in the second or third drafts of students' compositions.

Regarding how many errors students would like their teachers to correct, the results show that a vast majority of students (86%) want their teachers to correct all errors. Almost all students (90%) disagreed with no error correction at all. However, in the teachers' questionnaire based on rank-order only 13% of teachers reported that all errors should be corrected. Slightly more than half of the teachers (56%) reported that the extent of error correction depends on the student and the amount of time they have. It can be inferred that teachers do not correct errors consistently and students do not get corrections as much as they want.

With regards to which type of errors are most important to correct, a vast majority of students (87%) reported that the most important aspect of their writing to correct was grammar errors, followed by vocabulary choice, spelling and punctuation. The teachers' ordering of different types of errors to be corrected based on their importance was the same. Thus, it can be concluded that teachers and students agree that the most important error type to be corrected in student writing is grammar. This result is very similar to

Samuels' (1985) findings. Samuels found that 84% of ESL students think the most important aspect in writing is getting the grammar correct.

In the teachers' questionnaire, teachers were asked whether content was more important than form. According to the rank-order of means of the various aspects of writing teachers gave preference to "content over form". This result shows that teachers think content is more important than form, as Bosher (1990) suggested, they think that errors should be corrected after discovering meaning is complete.

Preferences for Error Correction Techniques

Students' most preferred error correction technique was "crosses out the incorrect item and writes in the correct form" based on both their ratings and rankings. Students' least preferred error correction technique was "no correction" based on their ratings and "only says there are errors someplace in the sentence" based on their rankings. Teachers' most preferred error correction technique was "uses codes" based on both their ratings and rankings. Teachers' least preferred error correction technique was "no correction" based on their ratings and "only says there are errors someplace in the sentence" based on their rankings.

Although there were some discrepancies between students' ranking of error correction techniques based on

definitions and students' rating of error correction techniques based on examples of techniques, when the responses were taken into consideration, students preferred the following error correction techniques in this order: (a) teacher crosses out the incorrect item and writes in the correct form, (b) underlines the error, but does not correct it and (c) uses different color inks. Teachers' reported preference indicate that they (a) use codes to correct errors, (b) underline the error, but do not correct it, and (c) cross out the incorrect item and write in the correct form. However, their actual usage of error correction techniques based on the sample composition in the teacher questionnaire indicated that the technique teachers use most frequently is (a) "uses codes", a technique preferred by only 3% of the students, followed by (b) "underlines or circles the error but does not correct it", a technique preferred by less than half (40%) of the students.

The results of this study show that both teachers and students think error correction is useful and errors should be corrected. However, the results imply that students want more error correction than they are getting. Students feel confident when they are corrected and think they learn from the correction of their errors. Teachers, on the other hand, think content is more important than form, but they are also optimistic that students learn from their errors.

Regarding error correction techniques, teachers actually use coding errors more than they use other techniques. Their second preferred technique, which they use, is underlining the error but not correcting it. However, students want more explicit techniques. Students' most preferred error correction technique is teachers' crossing out the incorrect item and writing in the correct form. Thus, the major finding of this study is that students want error correction in their writing, but they are not corrected in the way they want it, and not to the extent that they want.

Limitations of the Study

Due to time limitations the study is limited to students and teachers at BUSEL. In order to learn preferences for error correction techniques of Turkish university students in general, subjects from other universities would need to participate in the study, as well.

Another limitation is that only intermediate-level students were used as subjects in this study. Assuming there are differences in preferences for teachers' error correction techniques at different levels of language proficiency, the results of this study do not suggest student preferences at the beginning and advanced levels.

Finally, teachers were asked to correct the student paragraphs as they normally would correct while responding to students' writing. However, since teachers were part of a research study, they might have responded to the student paragraphs differently than they normally do.

Implications for Further Research

Since this study was conducted with intermediate-level students, it is recommended that further research be done including all levels of proficiency: beginning, intermediate and advanced, in order to determine if there are any differences in students' attitudes toward error correction and their preferences for error correction techniques based on language proficiency. In addition, if students are randomly selected from a variety of different types of universities (private and state), the results would be generalizable to all students in Turkey studying English at the university level. Thus, another suggestion for further research is replicating the study with students throughout Turkey in order to determine Turkish university students' preferences for error correction and error correction techniques.

Another suggestion for further research is related to error correction and teacher feedback on first and final drafts. Do student preferences for error correction

techniques on first and final drafts differ? And do teachers' preferences differ as well?

Another suggestion for further research is to investigate whether error correction actually increases accuracy in writing.

Pedagogical Implications

This study revealed that both teachers and students think that errors should be corrected in student compositions although discovering meaning is given importance in process writing. Both teachers and students think that students learn from the correction of errors. However, not to interrupt the process of discovering meaning, it is suggested that error correction take place after the discovering of meaning is complete, at the editing stage of the writing process. For error correction techniques, it is clear that teachers' and students' preferences are different. Although students want to be corrected explicitly, teachers actually code errors while correcting students' compositions. It is suggested that teachers determine students' preferences for error correction at the beginning of a writing course and take students' preferences into consideration when determining how they will actually give feedback on errors. Teachers could take either individual student's or the majority of

students' preferences into consideration. It is important for students to feel confident and positive and be able to use teacher feedback in their writing.

References

Abbott, G. (1980). Towards a more rigorous analysis of foreign language errors. IRAL, 18, 122-134.

Berthoff, A. E. (1981). The making of meaning: Metaphors, models and maxims for writing teachers. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Bosher, S. (1990). The role of error correction in the process-oriented ESL composition classroom. MinneTESOL Journal, 8, 89-101.

Burt, M. K., & Kiparsky, C. (1974). Global and local mistakes. In J. Schumann & N. Stenson (Eds.), New frontiers in second language learning (pp. 71-80). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Burt, M. K., & Kiparsky, C. (1974). The goofication: A repair manual for English. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Chastain, K. (1980). Toward a philosophy of second language learning and teaching. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Cohen, A. D. (1988). The processing of feedback on student papers. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), Research on learner strategies. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics. 5(2), 161-167.

Corder, S. P. (1973). Introducing applied linguistics. New York: Penguin Books.

Edge, J. (1989). Mistakes and correction. New York: Longman Inc .

Fathman, A. K., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing (pp. 178-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaies, S. J. (1983). Classroom-centered research:State of the art. The investigation of language classroom process. TESOL Quarterly, 17, 205-217.

Gorbet, F. (1980). To err is human: Error analysis and child language acquisition. English Language Teaching, 34, 22.

Gwin, T. (1991). Giving students the write idea: A way to provide feedback on writing. English Teaching Forum, 29, 2-5.

Hahn, C. (1987). Trial and error. English Teaching Forum , 25, 8-11.

Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, 141-163.

Hendrickson, M. J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research and practice. Modern Language Journal, 68, 387-398.

Hendrickson, M. J. (1980). Readings on English as a second language. In K. Croft (Ed.), Error correction in foreign language teaching, (pp. 153-173). Toronto: Newbury House.

Klassen, J. (1991). Using student errors for teaching. English Teaching Forum, 29, 10-16.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kroll, B. (Ed.). (1990). Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. Foreign Language Annals, 24, 203-218.

Lengo, N. (1995). What is an error? English Teaching Forum, 33, 20-24.

Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 207-228.

Mahili, I. (1994). Responding to student writing. English Teaching Forum, 32, 24-27.

Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques in teaching writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 229-258.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. TESOL Quarterly, 25, 407-430.

Rifkin, B., & Roberts, D. F. (1995). Error gravity: A critical review of research design. Language Learning, 45, 511-537.

Robb, T., Ross, S. & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 83-93.

Samuels, S. (1985). English language program writing lab questionnaire. Paper presented at 5th Annual TESOL Regional Conference, Milwauke, October, 1985.

Schwartz, M. (1984). Response to writing: A college-wide perspective. College English, 46, 55-62.

Semke, H. D. (1984). The effects of the red pen. Foreign Language Annals, 17, 195-202.

Spada, N., & Lightbrown, M. P. (1993). Instruction and the development of question in L2 classrooms. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5, 205-221.

Appendix A

Consent Form

Dear.....

You are invited to participate in a research study about teachers! and students' preferences on error correction in writing. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

I am conducting this research project as part of my studies in the MA TEFL Program at Bilkent University.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts in this study. All responses will remain confidential. That is, nobody, except for me will see your responses and your names will not be used in the reports.

If you have any questions about the study, you may contact either me or the study advisor. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Selma Yılmaz
MA TEFL Program
Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences
Bilkent University

The Study Advisor:
Dr. Susan Bosher
MA TEFL Program
Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences
Bilkent University

Appendix B

ERROR CORRECTION TECHNIQUES QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Hello! This questionnaire is designed for a research project on students' preferences for error correction techniques which is being carried out as a part of my studies in the MA TEFL Program at Bilkent University. Your participation in this research is voluntary and there is no risk involved. All responses will be kept confidential; nobody, except for the researcher, will see your responses, and your names will not be used. Therefore, do not hesitate to respond to the questions honestly.

Thank you for participating and answering the questions thoughtfully!

A-

1-Are you Male or Female?_____

2-What is your place of birth?_____

3-Which high school did you graduate from?_____

4-Which department at Bilkent do you hope to attend?_____

5-How long have you been studying at BUSEL?_____

B-

For question 6 please refer to the following scale and circle the number that most closely corresponds to your opinion.

1=very important
2=important
3=somewhat important
4=a little important
5=not important at all

6- ON THE FINAL DRAFT OF A PAPER HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO YOU FOR YOUR TEACHER TO POINT OUT ERRORS IN:

a-grammatical form	1	2	3	4	5
b-punctuation	1	2	3	4	5
c-spelling	1	2	3	4	5
d-vocabulary choice	1	2	3	4	5

For questions 7-8 please refer to the following scale and circle the number that most closely corresponds to your opinion.

1=Strongly Agree
2=Agree
3=Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4=Disagree
5=Strongly Disagree

7- ON THE **FINAL** DRAFT OF A PAPER:

a-I feel irritated if the teacher corrects it.	1	2	3	4	5
b-I feel confident about my writing if the teacher corrects it.	1	2	3	4	5
c-I do not like getting my paper back with corrections on it.	1	2	3	4	5

8- WHEN THE TEACHER GIVES MY **FINAL** DRAFT BACK TO ME WITHOUT CORRECTIONS

a-I feel I am successful.	1	2	3	4	5
b-I feel irritated(upset, unhappy).	1	2	3	4	5
c-I would like to see my errors corrected.	1	2	3	4	5

For questions 9-10 please refer to the following scale and circle the number that most closely corresponds to your opinion.

1=Strongly Agree
2=Agree
3=Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4=Disagree
5=Strongly Disagree

9-ON THE FINAL DRAFT OF A PAPER; I WANT MY INSTRUCTOR:

a-to correct all the errors 1 2 3 4 5

b-to correct only major errors (errors in grammatical points that have been discussed) 1 2 3 4 5

c-not to correct any errors at all 1 2 3 4 5

10-WHEN THE TEACHER CORRECTS MY ERRORS:

a-I think I can avoid the same error next time 1 2 3 4 5

b-I learn from the correction of my errors 1 2 3 4 5

c-I do not think that error correction is useful for me. 1 2 3 4 5

d-I feel secure and confident about my final draft because it does not have any more errors. 1 2 3 4 5

C-

Order these error correction techniques according to your preference from the most preferred (# 1) to the least preferred (#8).

The teacher:

a-crosses out what is incorrect and writes in the correct word or structure (rewrites using the correct form).

b-underlines or circles the error (shows where the error is) but does not correct it.

c-indicates the error type using codes (e.g.: V-Verb, N-Noun, etc.).

d-does not correct the error on the paper but explains the relevant grammar point to the whole class in the classroom.

e-explains orally to individual students.

f-uses different color inks for distinguishing more important errors from less important ones.

g-only says there are errors in the draft and students must find them.

h-ignores the errors and pays attention to the ideas expressed.

i-other (please explain):_____

Order of preference from the most to the least preferred:

1-_____

2-_____

3-_____

4-_____

5-_____

6-_____

7-_____

8-_____

9-_____

D-

Look at the following sentences. Each sentence has been corrected in a different way. Please refer to the following scale and circle the number that best reflects your preference for each of the error correction techniques.

1=Strongly Like
2=Somewhat Like
3=Neither Like Nor Dislike
4=Somewhat Dislike
5=Strongly Dislike

1-When I got up, it is raining (there is no correction)	1	2	3	4	5
2-When I got up, it is raining (teacher comments on ideas, focus is not on grammar)	1	2	3	4	5
3-When I got up, it is raining (teacher circles the error)	1	2	3	4	5
4-When I got up, it is raining (teacher uses code)	1	2	3	4	5
5-When I got up, it is raining (teacher writes the correct form)	1	2	3	4	5
6-When I got up, it is raining (teacher indicates there is error someplace in the sentence)	1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Appendix C

ERROR CORRECTION TECHNIQUES QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Hello! This questionnaire is designed for a research project on teachers' preferences for error correction techniques which is being carried out as a part of my studies in the MA TEFL Program at Bilkent University. Your participation to this research is voluntary and there is no risk involved. All responses will be kept confidential; nobody, except for the researcher, will see your responses, and your names will not be used. Therefore, do not hesitate to respond to the questions honestly.

Thank you for participating and answering the questions thoughtfully!

A-

1-Are you Male or Female?_____

2-What is your highest degree obtained?____BA _____MA ____PhD

In what field of study is your highest degree obtained?_____

3-How long have you been teaching English?_____

B-

For question 4, please circle all options that you apply when you respond to student writing. (If you apply more than one option please explain when and why your application varies).

4) WHEN I RESPOND TO FINAL DRAFT OF STUDENT WRITING:

a-I correct all the errors

b-I correct only the major errors (errors in grammatical points that have been discussed in class).

c-I correct frequently occurring errors (repeated from earlier papers)

d-I do not correct errors; I comment on organization and content only.

e-It varies depending on the student and on the amount of time I have.

For question 5, please rank the options according to your order of importance. From the most important= # 1, to the least important= #5

5) WHEN I RESPOND TO STUDENT WRITING IN A FINAL DRAFT,MY PRIORITY OF FEEDBACK ON ERRORS IS IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER OF IMPORTANCE.

a-errors in grammar 1-_____

b-errors in punctuation 2-_____

c-errors in spelling 3-_____

d-errors in vocabulary choice 4-_____

e-content is more important than form 5-_____

For questions 6-7 please refer to the following scale and circle the number that most closely corresponds to your opinion.

1=Strongly Agree
2=Agree
3=Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4=Disagree
5=Strongly Disagree

6) ON THE FINAL DRAFT OF A PAPER:

a-I think teacher should deal only with content and organization. 1 2 3 4 5

b-I do not believe that error correction is useful. 1 2 3 4 5

7) WHEN I CORRECT STUDENT ERRORS:

a-I think students will avoid the same error next time. 1 2 3 4 5

b-I think students learn from the correction of errors. 1 2 3 4 5

C-

For question 8, order these error correction techniques according to your preference from the most preferred (# 1) to the least preferred (#9)

8) WHEN I RESPOND TO STUDENT WRITING:

a-I cross out what is incorrect and write in the correct word or structure (rewrite using the correct form).

b-I underline or circle the error (show where the error is) but I do not correct it.

c-I indicate the error type using codes (e.g.: V-Verb, N-Noun, etc.).

d-I do not correct the error on the paper, but explain the relevant grammar point in class.

e-I explain orally to individual students.

f-I use different color inks for distinguishing more important errors from less important ones.

g-I only say there are errors in the draft and students must find them

h-I ignore the errors and pay attention to the ideas expressed.

i-other (please explain):_____

Order of preference from the most (#1) to the least (#9) preferred:

1-_____

2-_____

3-_____

4-_____

5-_____

6-_____

7-_____

8-_____

9-_____

For question 9, look at the following sentences. Each sentence has been corrected in a different way. Please refer to the following scale and circle the number that best reflects your preference for applying these error correction techniques.

1=Strongly Like
2=Somewhat Like
3=Neither Like Nor Dislike
4=Somewhat Dislike
5=Strongly Dislike

9)

a-When I got up, it is raining 1 2 3 4 5

(there is no correction)

b-When I got up, it is raining 1 2 3 4 5

(comment on ideas, focus is not on grammar).

c-When I got up, it is raining 1 2 3 4 5

(teacher circles the error)

d-When I got up, it is raining 1 2 3 4 5

(teacher uses code)

e-When I got up, it is raining 1 2 3 4 5

(teacher writes the correct form)

f-When I got up, it is raining 1 2 3 4 5

(teacher indicates there is error someplace in the sentence)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

STUDENT PARAGRAPHS

Below are two student paragraphs. Please correct the errors as you normally would for your own classes.

A) I am alone on an island. When I got up I was on a beach. I was all wat and I was very hungrey too. So I walked toward a forest. I saw there was many fruit trees. But there were no any fruit on it. I was very tried but I still wanted to find some food. Well at last I found some potatoes under the ground. After I had eaten it I felt asleep under a trees. I was dreamt of my ship which had sank last night. Next morning I got up and saw little monkey. It looked like very funny so I used my hands to catch it, but it did not run away. I gave a potato to it. The monkey eat it very fast. After that it played with me and climbed up a tree and I folowed it.

B) My family is a large family, Having six people live together in a house. Each one has different way to help them relax. And also the way they thought is relaxing, having give me too much angry.

For example, my youngest sister is love chinese music, therefor whenever she at home do her homework always has the music on. That bother me a lot. Because she and I live in the same room making me have to stop with the arcurment with her.

But the most angry is get up in the morning with a disco music. That rely make me crazy. That whole day I just have bad feeling. That is my youngest brother relax's way.